DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 198 LI 003 833

AUTHOR	DeProspo, Ernest R.
TITLE	Data Collection and Description of HEA II-B Institutes - 1968-1969. Final Report.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
BUREAU NO	BR-00759
PUB DATE	Jan 72
CONTRACT	OEC-0-70-5234
NOTE	69p.; (0 References)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Data Bases; *Data Collection; Evaluation; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Librarians; *Library Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Higher Education Act of 1965 Title IIB

ABSTRACT

This study examines the first two years of the Higher Education Act (HEA) Title II-B Institute Program, 1968 and 1969. The primary objective is to describe the institutes and provide a data base for the program. The data base includes Division of Library Programs records, final evaluative reports, "plans of operation," and information on the institute participants and directors collected by mailed questionnaires. Unstructured, in-depth interviews were held with Regional Program Officers, Division of Library Programs staff, and with a sample of institute directors. During the two-year period 156 institutes were funded, which some 4668 participants attended. Most of the institutes were full-time residential programs with 67 percent held during the summer months. Roughly classified, some 39 percent of them were school library-oriented; the next highest, 10 percent, were oriented to public libraries. The directors reported the greatest impact (32 percent) was "stimulation and interaction between the regular staff and students and those of the institute." For the participants, attitude change, job satisfaction, job skills, and improved job performance were given the highest ratings. Directors derived greatest satisfaction from interaction with participants. The issues of greatest concern to directors were negotiations with the Division, participant selection, ad hoc decision-making, and timing. (Author)

ED 066198

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Final Report

Project No. 00759

Contract No. OEC-0-70-5234

DATA COLLECTION AND DESCRIPTION OF HEA TITLE II-B INSTITUTES - 1968-1969

Dr. Ernest R. DeProspo

Bureau of Library and Information Science Research
Graduate School of Library Service
Rutgers, the State University

New Brunswick, New Jersey

January, 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology

LI 003 833

Abstract

This study examines the first two years of the Title II-B Institute Program, 1968 and 1969. The primary objective is to describe the institutes and provide a data base for the program. The data base includes Division of Library Programs records, final evaluative reports, "plans of operation," and information on the institute participants and directors collected by mailed questionnaires. Unstructured, in-depth interviews were held with Regional Program Officers, Division of Library Programs staff, and with a sample of institute directors.

During the two-year period 156 institutes were funded, which some 4668 participants attended. Most of the institutes were full-time residential programs with 67 percent held during the summer months. Roughly classified, some 39 percent of them were school library-oriented; the next highest, 10 percent, were oriented to public libraries. The directors reported the greatest impact (32 percent) was "stimulation and interaction between the regular staff and students and those of the institute."

For the participants, attitude change, job satisfaction, job skills, and improved job performance were given the highest ratings. Directors derived greatest satisfaction from interaction with participants. The issues of greatest concern to directors were negotiations with the Division, participant selection, ad hoc decision-making, and timing.

Preface

A project of this nature requires a truly team effort if the primary objectives are to be met. In every way I have been most fortunate to have benefited from the positive contributions of many skilled and dedicated individuals. At the Bureau of Library and Information Science Research, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, the contracted agency, I want to formally acknowledge the contributions of Mrs. Kay McGinty, Research Associate, and Mr. F. William Summers, Doctoral Fellow. Without their contributions the completion of the project would not have been possible. To all of my other colleagues at Rutgers who have interacted during the various stages of the research, my thanks.

The cooperation of the Division of Library Programs, U.S. Office of Education, was exemplary throughout the study. Regional Program Officers of the Division were completely cooperative and helpful in tolerating our many questions and in giving of their valuable time.

Finally, to the HEA Title II-B institute directors and participants, who form the key data base for the study, my deep appreciation for your contributions.

Ernest R. DeProspo
Project Director

Background for the study

Institutes in librarianship are funded under the Higher Education Act of 1965. Title II-B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-329) offered assistance to institutions of higher education in the training of persons in librarianship. This act was an expanded version of one enacted in 1958, the National Defense Education Act, and both of these contained a section limiting available funds to the training of personnel for school libraries. Effective July 1, 1967, this limiting section of the law was repealed and funds became available for the training of library and information science personnel for public, special, college, and university libraries, and for library education personnel. The purpose of the institute program, basically, is to upgrade and update the competencies and skills of librarians and information scientists and library educators.

The first funding year then, for institutes in librarianship under the new broader specifications, was fiscal year 1968. The first two years of its operation, 1968 and 1969, were selected for a study as a prelude to an evaluation of the institute program as a mechanism for training and retraining librarians. The goal of the research was to collect a data base from which better estimates could be made of the probable benefits of the institutes to a) the participants, b) the directors, c) the participants' employers, and d) the field of library education.

Related research is, for all practical purposes, non-existant.

This report describes the data collection methods of the research team, the results of their analyses of records, reports, questionnaires, and personal interviews, and their conclusions, drawn from the data described.

The immediate objective of the investigation was to provide a basis for a descriptive report on the institutes conducted for the 1968 and 1969 programs. The research team used Division of Library Programs records, including data collected and reported by directors on each participant at the time of the institutes, and final evaluative reports submitted by directors at the conclusions of the institutes. The finalized versions of the institute proposals, called "Plans of Operation" by the Office of Education, provided a source of data on the institutes themselves.

Up-to-date background data on both directors and participants, along with subjective evaluations of career benefits, was collected by mailed questionnaires to both groups. The mailed questionnaires to the participants and institute directors was a part of the doctoral dissertation research undertaken at Rutgers by Mr. F. William Summers,

Assistant Dean, Graduate Library School, University of South Carolina. We are especially indebted to Mr. Summers for his cooperation and sharing of data in this study. A total of 630 questionnaires were returned by participants and 78 by institute directors. The background characteristics of the sample of participant respondents closely parallels those of the total participant population, collected from the Opening Day Reports. Thus it seems likely that Mr. Summers' sample is a representative one. Plans of Operation and Opening Day Reports were examined for each of the 156 institutes, and Narrative Reports were collected and examined for 101 institutes.

The research was carried out by the Bureau of Library and Information Science Research, at the Graduate School of Library Service, Rutgers University. The project was directed by Dr. Ernest R. DeProspo, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Library Service, Rutgers University. Other members of the research team were Mr. Philip M. Clark, Executive Director of the Bureau, Mrs. E. Kay McGinty, Research Associate, and Mr. F. William Summers, doctoral candidate at Rutgers Graduate School of Library Service and Assistant Dean at the Graduate Library School, University of South Carolina.

As a descriptive study with the prime focus on systematically building a data base, the study has obvious limitations. Since no effort was made to deal with control and experimental groups, this being beyond the purview of the study, caution should be exercised in drawing conclusions from the data. The research team has carefully avoided making any firm conclusions which would indicate a cause and effect relationship between the institute program and specific benefits to the individuals involved or to the field. It is our conviction that any such analysis must follow, not precede, a descriptive account such as the following. Obviously, those required to initiate policy and operate within the real constraints of scarcity must provide their own limitations to the study. It should also be obvious that, since Title II-B is an on-going program, implications should be made to the extent that they have import to the current or anticipated event. Not to do so would surely be inappropriate for any educational or governmental agency.

Methods and procedures

Data was gathered on all HEA Title II-B Institutes on Librarianship funded during the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 from three principal sources. These were: 1) Office of Education records in Washington, consisting of forms and other pieces of information filed by institute directors with the Division of Library Programs; 2) Rutgers doctoral dissertation data (referred to above) consisting of results from a mailed questionnaire to a sample of participants at 1968 and 1969 institutes and from another questionnaire sent to all directors of those institutes; and 3) in-depth interviews with regional Office of Education Program Officers and selected institute directors.

The bulk of the data from the Office of Education records was collected and processed by Mrs. E. Kay McGinty, a research associate on the project. Opening Day Reports, filed for all institutes, were to contain the name, sex, race, salary, age, and number of dependants of each participant. The director was to mail this brief, informal report to the Division of Library Programs the day his institute began. A copy of each of these reports was made and the data on each participant coded and tabulated. From this data tabulations of state and O.E. region of residence were made for 4668 participants of 1968 and 1969 institutes. Also, frequency distributions on sex, age, race, and salary were derived for large proportions of the participant population.

Descriptive data about the institutes, including characteristics such as type, intensity, level, and geographic area served, was transcribed onto forms designed for that purpose from the Plans of Operation submitted by the directors. These Plans of Operation were the finalized forms of the Proposals, agreed on by the directors of the institutes and the Division of Library programs after negotiations were completed. The format for the Plan of Operation is appended. The descriptive data collected in this way was tabulated for the 156 institutes funded in fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

One hundred one Narrative Reports were also collected from the Division of Library Programs files. These reports were brought to New Brunswick, read, and selected data were tabulated. The Narrative Report was a final, evaluative report to be filed by the director at the conclusion of the institute. Each director received specific instructions on how this report was to be written, but they varied widely in form and content. It was finally determined that the only usable information contained in the reports was the director's evaluation of the "potertial impact of the institute on regular academic year program of the institution," (which was given in only 69 of the 101 reports collected and examined).

Interviews with regional Office of Education Program Officers, with

Division of Library Programs staff members, and with institute directors were conducted in person by the Project Director and Mr. Summers. In all cases the interviews were scheduled in advance and the respondents informed of the nature and scope of the study. Every individual contacted agreed to serve as a respondent. Since each institute represented a unique situation, no effort was made to obtain a random sample of the institute directors. However, an attempt was made to obtain a geographical spread. The respondents were assured of anonymity at the beginning of each interview and reassured at any point at which the interviewer sensed hesitance. The length of the interviews varied, with the shortest just under an hour and the longest more than two hours.

The interviewers took brief, catch-word notes during the interviews and, immediately following each interview, reconstructed it on tape. These tapes were later classified under various headings which provided the basis for analysis. In-depth, unstructured interviews, by definition, provide for a wide variety of response. The primary object of such interviews is to ascertain patterns and trends in the responses which appear both representative and important to the study. Analysis of the interviews in this report was to that end. No attempt was made to question the legitimacy of or "correct" any response. It was considered that the individuals questioned were expressing views toward a program in which they had expended considerable time and thought.

The other source of descriptive data used in the report is doctoral research carried out by Mr. Summers (see Appendix C).

In any serious study decisions must be made throughout on matters of technique and interpretation. It is important to keep in mind both the purpose of the study and the constraints under which it is carried out. In this study, the volume and variety of data was such that primary efforts were made to combine and cluster those variables which provided the best "profile" of the institute program. Within that context it seemed superfluous to include statistical tests simply for the purpose of such inclusions. It is critical that "statistical significance" not be confused with "importance." Put another way, what is important, obvious, or clear from the data may not be statistically significant and vice versa. For most of the data presented in this report tests for significance are inappropriate. Again, the purpose of the study must direct the researcher as to the most appropriate techniques to use.

Description of the data collected

The Policies and Procedures Manual, sent to all directors of the Institutes for Training in Librarianship, requests on page 25 (page 33 in the 1971 edition) "A 'Narrative Evaluation Report' within 30 days after the completion of the institute." The format sent to directors as a guide to its writing describes the report as follows: "While the report may be done in narrative style, it should be evaluative rather than descriptive. It should be an appraisal of all significant aspects of the institute." These reports were submitted for a total of 146 of 156 institutes as of April 1971. They were submitted for all but three 1968 institutes - 62 reports, and for all but seven 1969 institutes - 34 reports. (It is possible that some of these reports have come in since the data collection activity was ended.) The reports averaged 5 to 10 pages of text, with letters, clippings, schedules, lists of participants, photographs, and sometimes questionnaires and papers presented appended. As was previously stated, 101 of these reports were read and selected data contained in them was collected on forms prepared for that purpose.

Also collected from the Division of Library Programs records were copies of all Opening Day Reports submitted. Although these were not specified as required in the Policies and Procedures Manual during the 1968-1969 period, they are requested on page 16 of the Instructions for Directors; 1969-70 Program, (and were evidently requested informally for some time before):

> ...After the actual number of participants and dependents has been ascertained, a report must be submitted to the Division of Library Programs, Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Library Programs no later than the day the institute begins. This report (Opening Day Report) must include the following information:
>
> Name and address of participant
> Sex
> Race
> Age
> Salary at time of selection
> Number of dependents

From these reports data on each participant were collected and coded. Although Opening Day Reports in some form were filed for all institutes, many were no more than a list of participants. Sixty of the reports lacked at least one of the above-mentioned sets of data. In 22 reports none of the above statistics were given. Salary was not reported on 44 lists; 34 did not include race, and 23 did not give age; 28 did not give sex, although this could generally be determined by the participant's name. Data from these reports were coded and tabulated for each of 4668 participants.

Information was also collected from the Plans of Operation (the Proposals, in final form). From these the exact dates of the beginning and end of each institute were coded. Also the type, subject, and level of each institute, and the participant category and geographical area served by each were recorded and coded. This information, along with the length and intensity (full- or part-time) of the training program, the number and classification of staff and the amount of the grant award, was transferred onto prepared sheets, one for each institute. Certain pieces of Narrative Report information were also transferred onto these sheets. These latter included the number of inquiries received from prospective applicants, the number of applications received, the number of qualified applicants, and the number of participants; the potential impact of the institute on the regular academic year program of the institution; what enrollees said was the most significant thing that happened to them during the institute; and what enrollees say they will do differently as a result of the institute.

Data from the Plans of Operation, the Opening Day Reports, and the Narrative Reports were collected from files kept by the Division of Library Programs, U.S. Office of Education, in Washington, D.C. The data were coded and tabulated for each institute and each participant.

Description of the institutes

During fiscal years 1968 and 1969, 156 Institutes for Training in Librarianship were funded. The distribution of institutes among the nine U.S. Office of Education designated regions during that two-year period is as follows:

TABLE 1: Distribution of Institute Proposals Submitted, Institutes Held, and Population, By Region

O.E. Region:	Proposals Submitted (263)	Institutes Held (156)	Proportion of U.S. Population (179,323,175)
Midwest	22%	22%	20%
West Coast	16	17	13
Southeast	14	14	11
Southwest	12	14	10
South Atlantic	11	10	10
Middle Atlantic	11	9	19
Rocky Mountain	6	5	2
North Plains	4	5	9
New England	3	3	6
(Guam, Puerto Rico)	(1)	(1)	
	100%	100%	100%

The proportional distribution of institutes to O.E. regions generally approximates the proportions of the total population residing in each region, with one exception. A statistical test of the two distributions shows them to be highly correlated, as is obvious in Table 1, above. The table also shows, however, that the proportion of institutes held in the Middle Atlantic region is less than half the proportion of the population residing in that region -- 9 percent and 19 percent, respectively. Population is obviously not the only factor operative in the allocation of institutes.

The relationship between the distributions of institute proposals submitted and those funded (Institutes Held, in Table 1) for the nine regions is much closer than that between institutes funded and population. As can be seen in the table, the rank orderings for these two variables is virtually identical and the proportional distributions parallel each other closely. The level of proposal submission, then, certainly was critical in the funding of institutes.

This latter conclusion also requires some qualification, however. When the ratio of proposals funded to proposals submitted are examined

for each region (see Table 1a, below), important though not statistically significant differences can be observed. For example, 29 proposals were submitted from the Middle Atlantic region and 14 were funded, a ratio of .48. The comparable ratios for the Southwest, West Coast, Southeast, and Midwest were .71, .64, .61, and .60.

TABLE 1a: Ratios of Institute Proposals Funded to Proposals Submitted

	Proposals Funded/Submitted	Ratio
North Plains	8/11	.73
Southwest	22/31	.71
West Coast	27/42	.64
Southeast	22/36	.61
Midwest	34/57	.60
South Atlantic	15/30	.50
Rocky Mountain	8/16	.50
Middle Atlantic	14/29	.48
New England	4/9	.44
Overall ratio	156/263	.59

When the total amount of grant award funds allocated to a region for institutes is examined, differences between the Middle Atlantic and the other four heavily populated regions are even more dramatic. The Midwest, West Coast, Southeast, and Southwest regions received a considerable majority of the funds. In these four regions, which together account for 54 percent of the country's population, 67 percent of the institutes were held at a cost of 66 percent of all grant award funds allocated. The Middle Atlantic region receives only 5 percent of all institute funds awarded, while it holds 19 percent of the population.

TABLE 2: Distribution of Grant Award Funds by Region

O.E. Region	Amount Awarded*	Proportion of Total
Midwest	$1,431,018	21%
West Coast	1,169,051	17
Southeast	1,140,000	17
Southwest	721,764	11
South Atlantic	670,250	10
New England	427,158	6
North Plains	376,657	6
Middle Atlantic	321,596	5
Rocky Mountain	206,078	3
(Guam, Puerto Rico)	(270,170)	(4)
	$6,733,742	100%

* Totals calculated from figures in Plans of Operation.

In the distribution of institutes among the states, California and Michigan led, with 9 percent and 8 percent of the institutes respectively; they were followed by New York, with 6 percent, and Georgia Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas with 5 percent each.

In order to be able to examine the degree of "localness" of the institute program, for each institute the percentage of participants from the state in which it was held and the percentage from the region in which it was held were computed. These percentages were then grouped by state and by region and means were calculated. When the institutes were grouped by region, the following mean percentages of local participants at the institutes were derived:

TABLE 3: Means, by Region, of Percentages of Local Participants

For Institutes Held in:

New England	93%
Southeast	77
Rocky Mountain	76
West Coast	68
North Plains	67
South Atlantic	62
Southwest	62
Middle Atlantic	58
Midwest	47

The Midwest, with the greatest proportion of institutes, has the lowest mean percentage of local participants at its institutes. This is consistent with the fact that this region ranked first in proportion of institutes, but third in proportion of all participants residing in the region. (See Appendix Tables 3 and 4.)

Of the total 156 institutes, 22 had recruited virtually all of their participants from the region in which they were held; the second most frequently occurring proportion, or mode, was 83 percent, that is, 25 out of 30 participants from the region in which the institute was held.

The mean percentages of local participants (in this case, from the same state) for those states with large enough numbers of institutes to make such figures meaningful, are as follows in Table 4. California and Michigan, the two states with the largest numbers of institutes, differed greatly in the mean percentages of participants in attendance from the same state. Michigan and Wisconsin each had about one quarter of their participants from their own state, while California had more than twice that proportion, and Louisiana almost three times as many local participants. These figures are entirely consistent with those for the corresponding regions -- the Midwest and Southwest.

TABLE 4: Means, by State, of Percentages of Local Participants

For Institutes Held in:

Louisiana	74%
North Carolina	68
Texas	64
California	51
New York	48
Georgia	38
Wisconsin	25
Michigan	24
Oklahoma	21

The vast majority of the institutes were full-time, residential programs -- 89 percent, and most were held during the summer months -- 67 percent. They varied in length from one week to a full year, but the modal length was from 3 to 8 weeks (38 percent). Another 26 percent were two weeks in length. (See Appendix Tables 11 to 13 for more details.)

Classification of the institutes by type is difficult and cannot be definitive. However, based on our classification we find that 39 percent of the institutes trained librarians for work in school libraries. The second highest ranking area was public libraries, for which 10 percent of the institutes trained personnel. A complete breakdown of institutes by type of library for which the training was intended is given below in Table 5.

TABLE 5: Types of Libraries for which Institute Training Intended

School libraries	39%
Public libraries	10
Special libraries	6
University/college libraries	6
Institutional libraries	5
Library schools	4
Community college libraries	2
State Library	2
Other	1
Not specified	25
	100%

When the institutes were coded for subject there were frequent overlaps. For example, an institute might have dealt with the problems of selection of materials in Asian studies. Such an institute

would be coded under "subject specialty" and also under "selection" in the coding scheme used by the research team. The percentages in each category are given in Table 6.

TABLE 6: Subject reas of the Institutes

General librarianship	32%
Audio-visual materials	27
Group specialty	23
Administration	9
Technical services	8
Subject specialty	8
Selection	6
Automation	6
Systems analysis	3
Acquisitions	2
Reference	2
Research	2
Personnel	1
Miscellaneous	6

Institutes were also coded for patron groups to whom service was directed. Thirteen institutes (8 percent) dealt specifically with service to urban, poor, and/or disadvantaged groups. Black, Spanish-surnamed, and American Indians were among the ethnic groups that some institutes geared their training programs toward the service of, but over 95 percent of the institutes named no such ethnic group. (See Appendix Tables 16 to 18.)

Summers' questionnaire study yielded additional data about the institutes. From the responses to two of the questions asked of participants, it is possible to reconstruct some of the recruiting patterns of 1968 and 1969 institutes. Participants were asked how many other HEA Title II-B institutes they had attended, and how they had heard about the particular institute specified on the questionnaire. Ninety two percent of the respondents reported having attended no other institute since 1968. Seven percent had attended one other institute since that year (41 individuals) and only one percent had attended two or more institutes in addition to the one about which they were questioned. It should be noted here that the sampling procedure was carried out to exclude individuals who had attended two or more institutes during the period studied. The questionnaire also provided a list of ways in which the participatns may have heard about the institute, prior to attendance. More than one response was accepted on this question as it was assumed that an individual may have heard from more

than one source. The most frequent responses indicated that the largest proportion of participants were directly contacted and solicited for institute participation. The breakdown of all responses is as follows:

TABLE 7: Ways Participants Reported Having Heard About the Institute

Brochure mailed to my place of employment	30%
Brochure mailed to me	26
Publicity in professional literature (journals, etc.)	22
From my superiors	22
Other librarians or associates	16
Through my affiliation with the university at which the institute was held	11
Newspaper publicity	4
Some other way	4

(More detailed tables on all questionnaire data are contained in the Appendix.)

Institute "impact" was the only item in the Narrative Report that was reported consistently enough to produce useful tabulations. Some of the types of impact described by directors were as follows:

TABLE 8: Impact of Institute on Regular Academic Year Program
(Base=69)

Stimulating interaction between the regular staff and students and those of the institute.	32%
Some participants plan to enroll in courses or in the regular program.	22
Subject of the institute will be taught as a regular course.	22
Materials used or produced by the institute will benefit the regular program.	20
Resulted in an interdisciplinary mixing of the regular faculty.	16
Good public relations for the school.	16
School has a limited program; the institute enriched it.	12
Subject of the institute will become a major in the curriculum.	6
School has no regular program in the field; the institute filled the gap.	4
Will publish as a result of the institute.	3

As can be seen in Table 8, only 69 of the 101 reports collected and analyzed included a discussion of the impact of the institute on the sponsoring institution. Of these, 4 reported no impact, and 65 reported some positive benefit to their institution. Directors were also to report what the participants said was most significant to them and what they said they would do differently. The way in which various directors collected and reported this information differed so much that no useful tabulations or comparisons could be made. Some directors had each participant fill out a questionnaire at the end of the institute, asking them specifically what was most significant to them and what they planned to do differently. Of these directors, some appended the questionnaires to the Narrative Report, some summarized the results of the questionnaires, and some included typed lists of all answers to these questions in the reports. Some directors had not asked those questions directly, but had used paraphrased or similar questions (such as, What was the most important thing that happened to you during the institute? or What was your most exciting experience during the institute?). Naturally these questions were not parallel to those in response to the former questions. Some directors chose to question participants informally, rather than use questionnaires. Their reports also tended to summarize, rather than report, the attitudes of the participants. Some of the directors did not seem to have questioned participants at all, but gave their own opinions of ways in which the institute affected the participants.

In general, the types of things mentioned as "most significant" were a greater awareness of some problem and its complexity; acquisition of new skills; increased self-confidence; opportunity to meet leaders in the field; opportunity to meet others with similar problems; new conception of own role (as librarian, media specialist, etc.) The items mentioned that participants would "do differently" were revise system; try to be more active in decision-making; work more closely with teachers; be more flexible; try to acquire new materials/equipment; have greater understanding, sensitivity in relation to specific patron group (children, ethnic group, etc.).

Description of participants at time of institute attendance

Of the descriptive characteristics by which the population of institute participants for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 may be identified, only the sex designation is comprehensively reported. Almost three-fourths of the 1968 and 1969 institute participants were females.

TABLE 9: Distribution of the Institute Participants by Sex

Females	72%
Males	28
	100%

Eighty-five percent of those participants who were identified by race or ethnic group in Opening Day Reports were white. The largest proportion of minority group members identified were blacks, who made up 11 percent of the participant population (for which the data was supplied.) Oriental and Spanish-surnamed participants accounted for 2 percent and 1.4 percent respectively, of the total, while 0.2 percent of the participants were identified as American Indians.

TABLE 10: Distribution of the Institute Participants by Ethnicity
(Base = 3746)

White	85%
Black	11
Oriental	2
Spanish-surnamed	1.4
American Indian	0.2
	100%

At the time of their attendance at the institutes, participants were fairly evenly distributed in age groups up to 50, with somewhat fewer beyond that age. Twenty-four percent were aged 30 or younger, 27 percent were 31 to 40, 29 percent were 41 to 50. Eighteen percent were between 51 and 60, and only 2 percent were over the age of 60. Age was unreported for 17 percent of the total participant population. (See Appendix Tables 21 to 23.)

Institute participants had a mean salary of $8576 at the time of institute attendance. This figure is based on the 3005 cases for whom salary was reported, and who were earning a salary at the time of their attendance. (Five percent of the participants for whom this data was reported earned no salary at the time of their attendance.) When salary ranges of $2500 were set, the largest proportion of participants fell in the $5000 to $7500 group - 33 percent. Salary was not reported for 32 percent of the population, or 1491 participants. (See Table 11 below.)

TABLE 11: Distribution of the Institute Participants by Salary Group
(Base = 3177)

No salary	5%
Under $5000	7
$5000 - 7499	33
$7500 - 9999	27
$10,000 - 14,999	24
$15,000 and over	4
	100%

The mean salary for male participants at the time of their attendance at the institutes studied was $10,825, while the mean salary for female participants was $7684, or $3141 less. When the mean salaries are examined for each ethnic group, the differences are not so great between the two largest groups, blacks and whites, as between males and females. The mean salaries for these groups are given in Table 12.

TABLE 12: Mean Salaries of Institute Participants by Ethnic Group

Bases:			
2479	White	$8808
367	Black	7092
13	Oriental	10023
41	Spanish-surnamed	4880
7	American Indian	7571

The excessively low mean of the Spanish-surnamed group is due to the fact that 25 of those 41 participants attended an institute at the University of Puerto Rico specifically aimed at training young sub-professionals from that island. In considering the mean salaries of Oriental and American Indian participants, the extremely small size of the bases should be noted.

When mean salaries of participants are examined by age group, it can be seen that salary level peaks in the 41 to 50 age group, and again rises for those participants who work beyond age 60.

TABLE 13: Mean Salaries of Institute Participants by Age Group

Bases:			
711	30 and under	$7019
806	31 to 40	8729
866	41 to 50	9241
513	51 to 60	9061
57	61 and over	10244

The mean salary shown for those participants over 60 is most likely not typical of the profession at large, but is accounted for by the fact that, in general, librarians over the age of 60 were not sought as institute participants, as years of potential service in the profession was often

a criterion for selection. Thus, those participants who were selected at an advanced age were likely to be superior candidates in other respects, and/or to be in a position of greater responsibility than the average participant.

Description of a sample of participants in April of 1971

The following descriptions are based on data collected in Summers' study, in part by a questionnaire sent to 921 participants at 1968 and 1969 institutes in April of 1971. The questionnaire was completed and returned by 630 respondents. There were no significant differences between the total participant population and the respondent sample of Summers' on the demographic variables of sex, age, and ethnic group, for which they were compared.

The sex distribution of the respondent sample was identical to that in the larger participant population - 72 percent female and 28 percent male. The breakdown by ethnic group was similar to that in the total participant group, but not identical. There were somewhat smaller proportions of black and Spanish-surnamed among the respondents and slightly larger proportions of white and Oriental respondents. This fact may have been due to a lower response rate among the former groups or to a higher proportion of the latter in the original population, for whom ethnicity was not reported. The age groupings of the respondents generally parallelled those of the original population. There were no significant differences between the participant population and Summers' sample on any of these demographic variables. (See Appendix Tables 28 to 30.)

The salary increases indicated by a comparison of data from the questionnaires with data from the Opening Day Reports collected two to three years before were considerable. From a mean salary of $8576 at the time of institute attendance, the respondents rose to a mean salary of $10,765 as of April, 1971, a difference of almost $2200, or more than a 25 percent gain. Salary was not reported for 70 of the 630 respondents, or 11 percent of the sample. A more detailed discussion of salary increases within various groups follows at a later point in this report.

Ninety-six percent of all respondents reported having at least a bachelor's degree. Sixty-six percent reported having earned at least a master's, and 3 percent had a doctorate. Almost two-thirds of all the respondents, 64 percent, have some degree in library science. Of those who hold such a degree, 82 percent have an M.L.S. - 52 percent of all respondents. Thus, 48 percent of the participants were not fully professionally trained. Among those who have no library science degree, 70 percent have completed some course work in library science; only 10 percent of the entire sample had no formal library science education. (See Appendix Tables 32 to 36.)

Ninety-three percent of all respondents were employed full-time. Only 2 percent were not employed at all. Eighty-four percent of the sample were employed as librarians. However, 90 percent were employed in a library of some type. Among the 604 respondents who reported the type of organization by which they were employed, the largest proportion,

40 percent, were employed in school libraries. The next two largest groups were 19 percent, employed in university libraries, and 17 percent employed in public libraries. Five percent of the respondents were employed in state libraries. Three percent were employed by library schools. Eighty-three percent of the respondents who reported their level of employment were employed in some supervisory position or were completely responsible for a small library (e.g., a school library); that is, they had decision-making responsibility. (See Appendix Tables 38 to 42.)

Two series of questions were used to determine the perception of the participants of career changes and their relationship to the institute program. The first series consisted of six statements of positive career change. In response to each of these, a "Yes" or "No" was to be checked to indicate whether the change had occurred in the career of the respondent. Then, if "Yes" is checked, one of four boxes is to be checked to indicate the degree to which the change was related to institute participation (strongly, moderately, slightly, or not at all). The six statements dealt with change of employment, increased salary, greater authority ("more people report directly to me"), greater responsibility, initiation of changes, and advancement to a higher level position.

The highest level of concurrence, 69 percent, was with the statement "I have initiated changes in the organization which employs me since I attended the institute." This change was also the one most often specified as related to institute participation, by 80 percent of those who agreed that the change did occur. The second most widely agreed upon change that occurred was "I exercise greater responsibility in my position since I attended the institute," to which 57 percent of those questioned responded "Yes." Three-fourths of those for whom that change had occurred perceived it as related to institute attendance.

TABLE 14: Perceptions of Career Changes as Related to Institute Attendance

	Yes	Related to Institutes	Not Related	Relationship Not Specified
"I have initiated changes in the organization which employs me..."	69%	80%	8%	12%
"I exercise greater responsibility in my position since..."	57	74	16	10
"My salary has increased, above a normal cost-of-living increase..."	43	52	37	11
"More people report directly to me since..."	37	65	26	9
"I have advance to a higher position since..."	27	67	24	9
"I have accepted employment with a different organization since..."	21	57	41	2

The two statements dealing with actual change in position or employer were the ones least often agreed with; that is, they were the least frequent changes occurring (see Table 14, above). And although 43 percent of the respondents agreed that their salaries had increased considerably, only half of those, the lowest percentage on any of the variables, attributed the change to the institute.

The second series of questions concerned perceived institute impact on the careers of the participants, and consisted of seven statements accompanied by scales on which respondents were to register the degree of their agreement or disagreement. The scales run from 0 (disagree completely) to 100 (completely agree). The statements were frequently similar to those in the first series, and thus provided a check on the reliability of the instrument. The mean ratings of agreement and the percents giving ratings within ranges of 25 are given below.

TABLE 15: Strength of Agreement with Change Statements, on a Scale of 100
(Ranked in order of mean ratings)

	Disagree 0-25	26-50	51-75	Agree 76-100	Mean Rating
"The institute has resulted in changes in my attitudes which are reflected in my work."	16%	32%	50%	2%	62
"I derive greater satisfaction from my work due to my participation in the institute."	18	36	44	2	60
"My skills in my job were significantly increased by the library institute."	19	37	42	2	58
"My overall job performance has inproved as a direct result of my participation in the institute."	21	34	42	3	57
"As a result of my participation in the institute, I have initiated changes in the system which employs me."	33	31	32	4	48
"As a result of my attendance at the institute, I am accorded greater respect by my colleagues."	39	33	26	2	44
"Because I participated in the institute I am now given greater responsibility in my work."	52	23	21	4	36

Among the variables given, attitude change, job satisfaction, job skills, and improved job performance were given the highest ratings of relationship to the institutes. These four variables are rather intangible when they are compared to, for example, "I have initiated changes in the system which employs me," or "I am now given greater responsibility in my work." This latter statement received a relatively low mean rating of agreement on this set of questions, but a relatively high rate of agreement (that it was related to institute attendance) on the first series of questions. This finding strongly suggests that the context is critical in the choice of statements. Specifically, it seems that the less tangible changes will be more frequently perceived, and perceived as related to institute attendance, than will more tangible changes (such as "I have advanced to a higher position" and "I have accepted employment with a different organization.") Thus, the two tools may not be viewed as adequate for making real determinations of the impact of the institutes on various aspects of the careers of the participants. It should be noted, however, that psychologically they may have a considerable effect on participants. That is, they may produce a subjective consciousness of change. This possibility may be a most important effect of the institute program, reflected more in the subsequent functioning of the participant librarians than the actual job skills which may have been acquired.

When the mean agreement ratings given the institute-impact statements are examined separately for blacks and whites, and for males and females, interesting and possibly significant patterns emerge. Blacks and females consistently agree to a greater extent with each statement associating positive career changes with institute participation than do whites and males, respectively. It has already been suggested that association of the changes with the institute program may be highly subjective. The results of further examination of the data indicates that blacks and females are more likely to perceive career changes and to relate them to institute attendance. This factor may be a result of higher expectations in those two groups than among the relatively more successful whites and males (see Table 16).

The one departure from the above-described pattern is also interesting. In response to the statement "As a result of my participation in the institute I have initiated changes in the system which employs me," males and females gave almost identical mean ratings of agreement (with males giving a fraction of a point higher mean). Blacks actually gave a lower mean rate of agreement than whites. Using the same assumption of subjectiveness used above, we must infer that females are less optimistic about their potential for initiating change than they are about other changes in their career, and that blacks are much less optimistic about this potential, in general, than are whites. It may be especially significant that males and females and blacks and whites differed so in their reaction to this statement in comparison to others, since this career occurrance was the one which received the most substantial proportion of affirmation in a list of six. Also, it was most frequently

judged to be related to institute participation (by 80 percent of those who agreed it had indeed occurred in their careers).

TABLE 16: Mean Ratings of Agreement by Sex and by Race

		By Race		By Sex	
	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Males	Females
	(623)	(502)	(55)	(175)	(445)
"The institute has resulted in changes in my attitudes which are reflected in my work."	62	62	69	58	63
"I derive greater satisfaction from my work due to my participation in the institute."	60	59	67	55	62
"My skills in my job were significantly increased by the library institute."	58	58	70	53	60
"My overall job performance has improved as a direct result of my participation in the institute."	57	56	67	51	59
"As a result of my participation in the institute, I have initiated changes in the system which employs me."	48	49	45	48	48
"As a result of my attendance at the institute, I am accorded greater respect by my colleagues."	44	42	58	42	44
"Because I participated in the institute I am now given greater responsibility in my work."	36	34	49	31	37

In addition to the two series of questions relating specific career changes to the institute, respondents were also asked to indicate, on a given list, the one way in which the institute benefitted them most, professionally. The four ways given were as follows:

"As a means of meeting other professionals in my field."
"As a source of new skills or knowledge in my field."
"As a means to a better position and/or higher salary."
"As a means of renewing my interest in my work."

They were also given the option of choosing none of the above and naming some other benefit. They were specifically instructed not to name more

than one benefit. The largest proportion of the respondents, 45 percent chose "As a source of new skills or knowledge in my field" as the chief way in which the institute benefited them professionally. The second largest group chose "As a means of meeting other professionals in my field." Nine percent mentioned renewing interest, and only 2 percent mentioned a means to a better position or higher salary (possibly because some felt this was a "professionally unacceptable" reason). Thirteen percent insisted on making more than one response.

Fortunately, the researchers had previously-collected salary data, from the Opening Day Reports, with which to compare current salary data from the questionnaires, and thus to measure that one indicant of change directly. As discussed above, the mean salary of participants who responded to the questionnaire survey is $10,765, almost $2200 more than the mean of all participants recorded in the Opening Day Reports, at the time of their institute attendance - $8576. The differences between the mean salaries earned at the time of the institute and now are shown in Table 17 by sex and race (the division is made only for blacks and whites, as the bases of the other ethnic groups are too small to be reliable).

TABLE 17: Changes in Mean Salaries, by Sex and by Race

Respective Bases		Mean Salary at Time of Attendance	Mean Salary Reported on Questionnaire	Percent Increase
(853, 168)	Males	$10,825	$13,355	23%
(2152, 391)	Females	$ 7,684	$ 9,652	26%
(2479, 457)	Whites	$ 8,808	$10,922	24%
(367, 51)	Blacks	$ 7,092	$ 8,839	25%
(3005, 560)	Total population	$ 8,576	$10,765	26%

As can be seen, females made proportionally larger gains than did males, and blacks made slightly larger gains than did whites, in mean salaries since the time of the institutes. However the real dollar differences between males and females and between whites and blacks has actually grown in the intervening two to three years. The difference between male and female mean salaries at the time of their attendance was $3141 and is now $3703. The difference between white and black mean salaries was $1716 and is now $2083. When the groups are divided into those making less than $7500 and those making that amount or more, the relative proportions are as follows, in Table 18.

TABLE 18: Changes in Proportions Making Under and Over $7500 by Race

	At Time of Attendance		Reported on Questionnaire	
	Whites	Blacks	Whites	Blacks
Under $7500	39%	65%	15%	27%
$7500 or more	61	35	85	73
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Viewed this way, it appears that blacks have made substantial gains since the institutes. It should be kept in mind, however, that the cutting point of $7500 is arbitrary, and relatively low, considering the means.

Except for salary, no previously collected career data was available for comparisons such as are made above. Thus, it was necessary to rely on the questionnaire for subjective reports by the participants (already discussed) and for reports of specific changes in position which may have occurred, in order to develop a complete picture of the impact which institutes had on participants' careers. Actual changes reported by participants on the questionnaire are presented in Table 19 and Table 20.

TABLE 19: Number of "Other" Employers in Past Five Years
(Base = 600)

No others	61%
One other	26
Two others	10
Three to six others	3
	100%

TABLE 20: Number of "Other" Job Titles in Past Five Years
(Base = 600)

No others	44%
One other	34
Two others	15
Three or four others	7
	100%

Thirty-nine percent of the respondents reporting their employment histories had changed employers within the past five years, while the remaining 61 percent had stayed with the same employer during that time. Fifty-six percent, however, had at least changed job titles during the last five years. Considering the age range of the institute participants, most of them in the middle groups, there does not appear to have been a great deal of job mobility. Salary gains, then, seem to have been made in the contexts of the work situations in which the participants were when they attended the institutes.

Description of institute director questionnaire respondents

Summers mailed to 120 institute directors a questionnaire which requested a variety of demographic data and responses on several evaluative questions. A total of 78, or 65 percent of the total, were returned.

The age distribution of the institute directors is given in Table 21. The distribution is fairly even, with the 41 to 50 and 51 to 60 age categories accounting for the highest percentages.

TABLE 21: Distribution of Institute Directors by Age

31 to 40	15%
41 to 50	33
51 to 60	35
61 and over	17
	100%

When compared on the basis of academic rank, a category which might be expected to be age related, the directors are shown to be in the higher ranks, as indicated in Table 22.

TABLE 22: Distribution of Institute Directors by Academic Rank

Professor	37%
Associate professor	31
Assistant professor	13
Instructor	3
Lecturer	1
Non-academic	15
	100%

It should be noted that these responses are based on the questionnaire distributed in the spring of 1971 and may not reflect the rank held by the directors at the time of the institute. As might be expected, given the high ranks which they hold, the directors tend to be well-educated, with 51 percent holding the doctorate and a total of 96 percent holding at least a master's degree.

TABLE 23: Distribution of Institute Directors by Highest Degree

Doctorate	51%
Master's Library Science	27
Master's other field	18
Bachelor's	4
	100%

TABLE 24: Distribution of Institute Directors by Annual Salary

Under $12,500	15%
$12,500-14,999	24
$15,000-19,999	28
$20,000 and over	33
	100%

While almost one-third of the directors receive more than $20,000, 37 percent make less than $15,000.

The directors are highly active in terms of professional writing and speaking. Eighty-two percent have had writings accepted for publication, and 71 percent have delivered papers to professional associations.

The directors were asked to respond to a number of changes attributable to institute participation. These responses are indicated in Table 25.

TABLE 25: Distribution of Directors' Responses to Changes Attributable to Serving as an Institute Director

Serving as an institute director has favorably affected my basic salary.	19%
Serving as an institute director has favorably affected my opportunity for promotion.	24
Serving as an institute director has favorably affected the amount of respect accorded me by my colleagues.	49
Serving as an institute director has resulted in my deriving greater satisfaction from my work.	68
Serving as an institute director has resulted in changes in my attitudes which are favorably reflected in my work.	53

While these responses are subjective and are addressed only to the respondent's perceptions of facts, rather than to some external measure of fact, some interesting conclusions are nevertheless suggested. Apparantly institute directors do not see their work as producing the tangible rewards of salary and promotion; rather they are able to perceive benefits in the intangible aspects of work satisfaction and attitude changes. Additional confirmation of the validity of this conclusion was obtained when the directors were asked to rank ten possible reasons for serving as an institute director. The mean rankings received by each reason are given in Table 26. (For further details see Appendix Table 50.)

TABLE 26: Mean Rankings Given Ten Reasons for Directing Institutes and the Proportions Ranking Each First and Second

Bases:		Mean Ranking	Proportion Ranking Each 1st or 2nd
61	Opportunity to follow a professional interest	3.1	48%
63	Gain additional support/prestige for the institution	3.5	37
57	Possession of skills and knowledge about the subject of the institute	3.6	42
65	Desire to work with anticipated participants	4.0	26
50	Interest in learning more about the subject matter	4.8	12
48	Desire to gain experience in continuing education	5.4	17
48	Prior experience in continuing education	5.4	8
41	Requested to do so by academic superior	6.3	20
41	Opportunity for professional advancement	6.7	5
39	Supplement or increase income	8.3	13

The rankings indicate that professional interests of the directors, support for the institution, knowledge of the particular subject of the institute, and the desire to work with the anticipated participants were the most important motivations. The latter reason is particularly interesting when it is considered that failure to attract the anticipated participants was one of the problems cited by directors in the field interviews (see page 27).

Requests of superiors, the opportunity for professional advancement, and supplementing or increasing income were the least important reasons. When compared with the demographic analysis of directors presented above in Tables 21 through 24, these facts are not surprising. By and large, directors tend to be people who have already advanced professionally. In the case of financial rewards, comments by the directors indicated that in many cases institutional policy rather than their own wishes prevented additional income. (See Appendix Table 50 for further details.)

The directors were asked on the questionnaire to specify persons who had been especially helpful in conceiving, planning, and carrying out their institute. In 14 percent of the cases the person mentioned was a U.S. Office of Education employee; in 11 percent of the cases the person was a State Library Agency employee; and in 67 percent of the cases some other person was mentioned, most often a colleague in the same institution. Eight percent of those returning questionnaires did not respond to the question.

As shown in Table 27, persons who serve as institute directors tend to have considerable experience in library work. No data was collected about the recency or nature of this experience. However,

when compared with the data in Table 28, which shows that 40 percent of the directors have never taught in a library school, it would appear that the institute directors brought substantial work experience to their role.

TABLE 27: Distribution of Directors by Years of Professional Library Work Experience Other Than Teaching

Less than one year	18%
Two to six years	16
7 to 12 years	26
13 to 18 years	17
19 to 23 years	10
25 years or more	13
	100%

TABLE 28: Distribution of Directors by Number of Library Schools with Which Associated in a Professional Capacity

None	40%
One library school	18
Two library schools	22
Three library schools	14
Four or more	6
	100%

Table 28 also suggests that the directors are not a particularly mobile group. Only five directors have been employed in four or more library schools. In actuality, only one person was employed in more than four schools.

The directors were also asked to indicate their experience in institutions of higher education other than library schools, and these results are shown in Table 29.

TABLE 29: Distribution of Directors by Number of Institutions of Higher Learning Other Than Library Schools with Which Associated

None	46%
One other school	20
Two others	13
Three others	6
Four others	12
No response to question	3
	100%

This table would suggest that the directors have a relatively wide variety of experience with slightly more than half of them having at least some experience in institutions of higher education other than library schools.

Field interviews

Unstructured, in-depth interviews were held with individuals from the following groups: (1) Library Program Officers in each U.S.O.E. Regional Office (for those who had been employed in 1968 and 1969); (2) U.S.O.E. Division of Library Programs staff; and (3) institute directors. A total of 41 individuals were interviewed. The distribution of these interviews is shown in Table 30.

TABLE 30: Distribution of Interviews by Employment of Respondents

Institute directors	17	41%
Regional Program Officers	8	20
Division of Library Programs staff	16	39
	41	100%

A. Institute Directors

The issues of greatest concern to the directors were those that related to the pre-institute period. These issues were negotiations, participant selection, ad hoc decision making, and timing.

1. Negotiations. -- A majority of directors interviewed felt that the negotiation process was unduly time-consuming and focused upon minutiae. Several reported that the director's skill at negotiating was more important than the substantive issues involved. In a number of cases directors were not satisfied with the reasons given for disallowal of items included in their proposals. Some (few) directors indicated that the negotiations process was sufficiently frustrating that they would be unlikely to serve again as an institute director.

Directors who experienced no problem with negotiations indicated that changes in their proposals had been only clerical or that there had been no changes.

The amount of experience with the Title II-B program did not seem a factor with regard to reaction to negotiations. The experienced directors were evenly divided in whether or not the negotiations phase was a problem for them. Directors from private institutions did not react to the negotiations process any differently than did directors from public institutions.

2. Participant Selection. -- The directors were nearly unanimous in identifying the participant selection process as a problem. In only four cases was it not so identified. Problems cited were: (1) the application form fails to provide adequate information; (2) institutes did not attract the audience at which they were aimed; (3) too few applicants; and (4) some people who were selected failed to appear.

The four directors who did not see participant selection as a problem had directed institutes which were aimed at a very specific audience. In at least one case the participants were almost entirely preselected. Another of these directors was also in the fortunate position of being able to interview all applicants.

Suggestions offered by the directors for remedying these problems included: (1) Eliminating the requirement that institutes be open to all applicants and permit institutes on a state or regional basis. This change would permit personal interviews with all applicants. (In fact, though, most institutes were so based. See Tables 3 and 4, pages 8-9.) (2) Notify the institution of grant awards much earlier to prevent compression of the participant selection process into a very narrow time period. (3) Provide a better application form or permit institutions more flexibility in devising their own form. (It should be pointed out that the form provided by U.S.O.E. is for guidance and assistance only and institutions are free to adapt to it. A number of directors reported that this had been done and that the results were satisfactory.)

3. Timing. -- The primary concern on the issue of timing was that final approval comes much too close to the beginning of institutes to permit directors to accomplish the many tasks necessary. In part the problem seems to arise because directors and their parent institutions have a different view of the negotiations process than does the Division of Library Programs. In the view of these institutions there is no assurance that an institute will take place until negotiations are completed. The Division of Library Programs, in its planning, tended to treat the announcement of grant awards as a greater commitment than did the schools. One result was that institutions did not undertake any substantive activities until negotiations were completed. The final planning and participant selection are then unfortunately complicated by pressures of time. This problem is especially aggravated when the staff for the institute was not definitely established at the time the proposal was submitted.

The directors also reported that there was not enough time between the announcement of the program and the deadline for submission of proposals to permit adequate proposal development. The comments suggested that better proposals would be developed and that there would be much greater correspondence between the proposal and the institute if a longer proposal preparation period were provided. Several directors commented that in some cases there has been substantial variance between the program of training outlined in the proposal and the program actually conducted in the institute. While the Division of Library Programs retains the ability to monitor such variations through the Plan of Operation, which is filed by the grant recipients following negotiation of the grant award, it is seen by directors as an area leading to some inequities. For example, a school may submit a proposal providing for a staff of well-known authorities; however, once in operation, the

institute may be staffed by persons of much less stature. It was felt by some directors that there may really be two proposals involved, one submitted for evaluation purposes and another for operation of the institute. To the extent that this criticism has validity or has gained credence, confidence in the program is eroded.

The comments by directors relative to operation of the institutes were less numerous as well as less substantive. In part this may be due to the fact that this is the area of the program in which the directors are solely responsible for the results and like all people they are less able to be self-critical.

A policy frequently questioned by directors was the prohibition of repeating the same institute or reinvolving the same group of participants in subsequent institutes. Directors felt that it would be especially valuable to work with the same participants because it would permit greater intensification of the educational experience. This prospect was seen as particularly important in subject areas in which the participants do not already have a background. Essentially, the directors argued that institutes, as part of a continuing education process, should be developmental and on-going. The Division of Library Programs, on the other hand, has seen a need to broaden the impact of the program to reach as many librarians as possible and to cover a wide spectrum of training needs, particularly given the justification of the program provided to Congress. The results of the interviews clearly indicated that this assumption is neither understood nor accepted within the field.

Several minor operational problems were cited, with much less frequency than those discussed above. These were:

(1) The policy that grant funds may not be used to purchase materials for participants. Directors felt that this policy tended to restrict the effects of the institutes at both ends, i.e., in some cases directors wanted to purchase materials for participants to read prior to arrival. In other cases, it was felt that because materials could not be supplied for later study, the long-term impact of the institute was lessened. Related was criticism of the policy that grant funds may not be used to issue proceedings or publications. Directors felt that this policy limited the contribution which institutes could make to the entire profession and limited its impact on participants as well.

(2) In several cases directors expressed resentment that grant funds were not available to provide social amenities to participants. Directors felt that they were expected to provide opportunities for participants to socialize, indeed, that their proposals were judged on the basis of whether or not such opportunities were to be provided. Yet the financial burdens for this fell upon the directors personally, or upon the faculty of the library school.

(3) The policy that regular library school students must be excluded

from the programs of the institute was cited as a source of frustration and a deprivation of an opportunity to broaden the impact of the institute upon the educational program. Directors recognized that the regular program must not be allowed to interfere with the institute's operation but were concerned that the institute brought persons of national repute to the campus and regular students were either denied an opportunity to hear this person or the visitor had to be asked to repeat the presentation, which was sometimes not possible and always an imposition.

(4) Directors were uneven in reporting that the administrative work load of the program was too heavy. Where the problem occurred it appeared to be intra-institutional in origin, rather than related to Division of Library Programs policy. Apparently the inclusion of funds for supportive staff in a grant budget does not always result in the addition of more staff to the library school complement. Division of Library Programs policy does not require that funds for supportive staff be used for staff in addition to those already with the institution.

The need for opportunities to evaluate the results of institutes was a frequently recurring theme. The policy of disallowing expenditures for follow-up evaluation was among the most frequently cited weaknesses of the program. Directors were nearly unanimous in agreeing that the present final day evaluation was almost totally useless in evaluating the institute. In fiscal 1971, policies of the Division of Library Programs included a requirement that institutes be evaluated both internally and externally. Further experience will be needed in order to determine the efficacy of this procedure.

In addition to weaknesses in their own evaluations, directors were concerned that the Division of Library Programs was unable to monitor and evaluate programs funded. These concerns of the directors can best be expressed by the following comment: "There is apparently no money available for the Office of Education to come on the scene to determine that they are getting their money's worth." Another director comments, "There is no one in O.E. to overlook institutes and pull out a new method of operation or to observe the patterns of good and bad methodology. O.E. did not have a mechanism to evaluate the evaluations done of each institute. The guidelines remained pretty constant year to year and did not reflect experience which would have dictated changes." Since the new requirements for evaluation of the institutes have yet to be applied, it remains to be seen whether or not the director's expressed desire for meaningful follow-up evaluation will be answered.

B. Regional Program Officers

Several Regional Program Officers saw in the institutes program an opportunity to further regional objectives and respond to regional needs. In these instances the Regional Program Officer indicated either that the region was not attracting enough librarians or that there was a critical need to improve the level of training of current practitioners, or both.

These Program Officers saw the program as an opportunity to assist in solving these problems and reported that they tended to "push" the institute program and served as liasons between institutions of higher education and practitioners in need of training. These Program Officers felt that their efforts had been successful and that their regions had benefited from the program.

The Regional Program Officers were about evenly divided in their views of the impact of the program. There was agreement that the most noticeable and significant impact had been in the school media field. It was also generally agreed that the area of academic libraries had received the least impact. Most Program Officers reported that the amount of evaluative feedback coming to them was minimal.

With one exception the Regional Program Officers felt that broadening eligibility for sponsorship of institutes to agencies other than institutions of higher education would be a desirable improvement. Most often cited as potential sponsors were state library agencies and state departments of education.

C. Division of Library Programs Staff

In general the concerns of staff members of the Division of Library Programs were similar to those of the institute directors and the Regional Program Officers. As would be expected, Division of Library Programs staff members indicated a better understanding and acceptance of many of the policies and procedures which institute directors and Regional Program Officers saw as problems.

The Division staff members saw lack of evaluation as one of the most serious problems in the HEA Title II-B Institute Program. In every case a lack of professional staff was cited as the reason that evaluation had not been undertaken on a systematic basis. Staff members who had monitored institutes thought that it was a valuable experience which could lead to significant improvements in the program, but they recognized that the opportunities to monitor institutes had been severely limited by both numbers of staff and funds for travel. Several respondents felt that the evaluation reports submitted by the institute directors could be an excellent source of evaluative information, but that there had not been sufficient staff to analyze these reports.

Staff members recognized that for a variety of reasons, most of which are beyond its control, the Division of Library Programs has not been able to follow a desirable time schedule. Cited as constraints in this area were Congressional appropriation actions, allocation and release of funds by the Administration, the necessity to provide institutions as much time as possible to prepare proposals, the evaluation

process, and the negotiation process. In general, while the Division of Library Programs staff members recognized timing as a critical problem, given the necessary steps in the process, there was little hope that the timetable could be expedited.

Staff members generally agreed that the institute program had its greatest impact in the area of school media. Reasons cited for this fact were: (1) during the period under study school librarians were responding to the new emphasis on media in the A.L.A.-N.E.A. standards for school media programs and saw the institutes as a means of quickly establishing training in this area; (2) institutions training school librarians already had several years experience with institutes under Title XI of the National Defense Education Act and were familiar with proposal writing; (3) because of state certification requirements school librarians expect to obtain additional training and they work in an evironment in which summer training is not only expected but rewarded, while this is not a factor in other types of libraries; and (4) because of school calendars school librarians have "free" time in the summer to attend institutes.

Next to school libraries, most respondents thought that library service to the physically handicapped and to institutionalized populations had received the greatest impact. It was pointed out that implementation of Title IV of the Library Services and Construction Act, which provided funds to the states for library service programs in these areas, coincided with the Title II-B institute program. Given the need to train rapidly personnel to provide services to the physically handicapped and institutionalized, the institute program was a natural vehicle. It was indicated that most of the persons now providing service in state correctional institutions, for example, received some or most of their training for that role in a Title II-B institute.

Division of Library Programs staff members recognized that public and academic libraries had probably benefited less from the program than had school libraries. A number of reasons were cited for this fact: (1) Public and academic librarians have difficulty finding time to attend training programs, especially for any extended period. The reward system for these librarians does not encourage additional training except for advanced degrees. (2) Public libraries have had difficulty over the years in establishing the need for full professional training and resist the use of partially trained persons. (3) Academic libraries are more interested in having their staffs obtain additional subject expertise than more professional training, except for certain specialized and limited areas such as systems analysis. (4) Public libraries find the locally focused and relatively short training opportunities provided by State Libraries and state Library Associations more suited to their needs and abilities than providing staff time for institute attendance.

Those interviewed felt that the Division of Library Programs had made an effort to encourage the development of training proposals for public and academic librarians and that these efforts had been, to a degree, successful, despite the constraints cited above.

It was clear from the interviews that the Division of Library Programs uses the negotiation process as an extension of its proposal-evaluation function, and that, through negotiation, it seeks to eliminate or ameliorate weaknesses indicated by the evaluators of proposals.

Conclusions

It is beyond the purview of this study to reach any definitive conclusions on the HEA Title II-B Institutes in Librarianship Program. At the same time though, there are two basic categories appropriate for emphasis: factual description of the program during its first two years of operation and tentative conclusions, which warrant careful consideration. Conclusions must be viewed from and tempered by the various parties to the program. Clearly the primary focus of interest which each party brings to the data for interpretation will, in part at least, influence their view. Thus each group, i.e., Division of Library Programs staff, Regional Program Officers, participants, institute directors, and institutions of higher learning, may well arrive at different conclusions as to how well the objectives of this Title II-B program were met. Evaluation of the program can and should only follow the descriptive data base presented in this study.

As the most extensive program of continuing library education today, the Institutes in Librarianship Program, after the first two years of operation, may be descriptively summarized as follows.

Institutes. During the two-year period 156 institutes were funded, with an estimated 4668 participants attending. The Midwest region ranked highest in number of institutes held (22 percent of the total), and highest in the proportion of funds received (21 percent). There was a fairly even spread among the regions of the West Coast, Southeast, and Southwest for both number of institutes held and dollars allocated.

The majority of the institutes, 89 percent, were full-time residential programs, with 67 percent held during the summer months. They varied in length from one week to one year, with the modal length from three to eight weeks.

Classification of the institutes is difficult and not definitive. Based on the research team's classification, 39 percent of the institutes were oriented toward school libraries; the next highest identifiable area, at 10 percent, was public libraries. Twenty-five percent of the institutes could not be classified in this way.

Participants. A profile of the participants shows that 72 percent were female, 28 percent male. Of those who could be identified by race or ethnic group, 85 percent were white; the largest identifiable minority group was black, 11 percent of the total. Participants were evenly distributed in age groups up to 50. They had a mean salary of $8576 at the time of institute attendance, and as of April 1971 showed a salary gain of 25 percent, with their mean salary rising to $10,765. Educationally, 96 percent of the participants held at least a bachelor's degree; 66 percent held a master's, and three percent a doctorate.

Sixty-four percent held some degree in library science, 82 percent of those holding an M.L.S. Some 93 percent of the participants were employed full-time; 84 percent of the total were employed as librarians, and 90 percent were employed in a library of some type. Forty percent were employed in school libraries.

The perceptions of the participants with respect to their institute experience revealed the following. A majority felt that they had initiated changes in the institution which employed them. The next highest proportion indicated that they exercised greater responsibility in their positions. Attitude change, job satisfaction, job skills, and improved job performance were given the highest ratings of concurrance (as results of institute attendance) by the participants. In general, blacks and females agreed to a greater extent than did males or whites with those statements associating positive career changes with institute participation. In one significant variation, females were less optimistic about their potential for initiating change, and blacks are much less optimistic about this potential than are whites.

Directors. A profile of the 120 individuals who directed the 156 institutes reveals the following. Roughly 68 percent of the directors are in the 41 to 60 age category; slightly more than half of them are over 50. Twenty-eight of them, or 37 percent, held the rank of full professor; another 24, or 31 percent, held the rank of associate professor. Twelve, or 15 percent, were in non-academic positions. Educationally, a majority (51 percent) hold the doctorate and 27 percent hold a master's in library science; 18 percent hold a master's in some other field. In all, 96 percent hold at least a master's degree. The directors are relatively high-paid persons, with slightly less than a third of them making more than $20,000 per year, and almost 60 percent making more than $15,000.

In the Narrative Reports many directors reported that the greatest impact of the program on their institution was the stimulation and interaction between the regular staff and students and those of the institute.

Apparently directors do not see their work as producing the rewards of salary and promotion. Rather they indicated that the most important reward areas were work satisfaction and attitude change. In terms of motivation, almost half of the directors indicate that the opportunity to follow a professional interest is the most important factor.

By and large the directors have had experience in continuing education and have already advanced professionally. They tend to have considerable experience in library work, with two thirds of them having had seven or more years; another 13 percent had more than 25 years of library work experience, exclusive of library school teaching.

Overall, the study presents a positive picture of the first two years of the Title II-B Institute Program. A new program, modest both in funding and experience, it appears to have had a considerable impact on the field. Just the number of individuals who were able to participate in a national program for the training and retraining of librarians, over 4500, may hold significance over the next five to ten years. Also, the program appears to have had a positive impact on a variety of institutions of higher learning. It has allowed the talented people connected with these institutions to broaden their experience and to influence a wide variety of individuals in the field.

The specific contributions of the program to library education are currently subject to the realm of the speculative; but it is clear that a positive contribution has been made, whatever its specific manifestations. Again, some national impact was achieved with a reasonably modest dollar contribution by the Federal government. The overall picture of the first two years of the program, with some changes indicated or suggested, is sufficiently sound to warrant continuing efforts in the institute program. Hopefully, also, ongoing evaluation of the effort will be made to assist in the kinds of improvements and modifications so vital to any dynamic operation.

APPENDIX A

Regions of the United States
as Designated by the Office of Education

I New England: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut

II Middle Atlantic: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware

III South Atlantic: West Virginia, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, North Carolina, District of Columbia

IV Southeast: Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Florida

V Midwest: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin

VI North Plains: Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota

VII Southwest: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico

VIII Rocky Mountain: Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Utah

IX West Coast: Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii

APPENDIX B

PLAN OF OPERATION FOR AN INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING IN LIBRARIANSHIP

Under Title II, Part B, Higher Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-329, as amended 1968

Name and address of institution of higher education:

Name: _____

Street address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____ Cong. Dist. __

Classification of Institute:

Type: ☐ School ☐ Public ☐ Academic ☐ Special ☐ Libr.Ed. ☐ Other

Subject: _____

Target Group: _____

Participant Category: _____

Geographical Area: _____

Length of Institute: ☐ Full-time ☐ Part-time ☐ Combination of Full-time and Part-time

Beginning: _____ (mo.,day,year) Ending: _____ (mo.,day,year)

Total number of full-time equivalent weeks (or days) of proposed training: (Count two half-day or evening sessions as one day.) ____

Total funds required:	Federal	Institutional	Total
Program support	$_____	$_____	$_____
Participant support	$_____	$_____	$_____
Total	$_____	$_____	$_____
Number of participants	____	____	____

Check if applicant institution has conducted a Title XI NDEA or Title ☐ II-B HEA Library institute and indicate year(s). _____

Name of Director: _____

Academic title: _____

Department: _____

Campus address: _____

Telephone No. (include Area Code): Office: _____ Home: _____

Signature of Director: _____ Date: _____

Name of Department Chairman or Dean: _____

Campus address: _____

Telephone No. (include Area Code): _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Signature of official authorized to submit proposal on behalf of institution

Signature: _____

Typed Name: _____ Title: _____ Date: _____

Name and title of official who will have custody of grant funds

Signature: _____

Typed Name: _____ Title: _____ Date: _____

The Assurance of Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 dated _____ applies to the application submitted herewith.

(To be signed by the proper official.)

Signed: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX C

The original plans of the researchers included a mailed questionnaire to all directors and to at least a sample of participants at institutes funded during fiscal years 1968 and 1969. Efforts to obtain clearance for such instruments, however, were stalled to the point where those plans had to be abandoned, as subsequent delays would have severely limited the potential for a reasonable response rate. It was deemed impractical by the researchers to mail questionnaires to a population consisting largely of persons in academic communities after the month of April. Beyond that time it was assumed that final examinations and approaching vacations would interfere greatly with questionnaire returning.

With the agreement of the Program Officer then, the research team concentrated its efforts on Office of Education file materials and personal interviews.

The data from mailed questionnaires to the participants and institute directors used in this report is part of a Rutgers doctoral dissertation currently being undertaken by Mr. F. William Summers, Assistant Dean, Graduate Library School, University of South Carolina. We are especially indebted to Mr. Summers for his cooperation and sharing of data in this study.

Mr. Summers mailed questionnaires to each of the 120 institute directors for 1968 and 1969 institutes, and to a sample of 921 participants (20 percent of all participants for those institutes) in April of 1971. He received completed questionnaires from 78 directors and from 630 participants; the profile data in the report is based on these two samples.

APPENDIX TABLES

Table 1: O.E. Regions Ranked by Percentage of Total U.S. Population
(1960 Total U.S. Population=179,323,175)

Rank Size		Population	Proportion of Total
#1	Midwest	36,225,024	20%
2	Middle Atlantic	34,614,744	19
3	West Coast	22,785,483	13
4	Southeast	20,289,240	11
5	Southwest	17,902,278	10
6	South Atlantic	17,286,326	10
7	North Plains	15,394,115	9
8	New England	10,509,367	6
9	Rocky Mountain	4,316,598	2
			100%

Table 2: O.E. Regions Ranked by Percentage of Total Grant Award Funds
(Total amount awarded, 1968-1969=$6,733,742)

Rank		Grant Awards	Proportion of Total
#1	Midwest	$1,431,018	21%
2	West Coast	1,169,051	17
3	Southeast	1,140,000	17
4	Southwest	721,764	11
5	South Atlantic	670,250	10
6	New England	427,158	6
7	North Plains	376,657	6
8	Middle Atlantic	321,596	5
9	Rocky Mountain	206,078	3
	Guam, Puerto Rico	270,170	4 (not ranked)
			100%

Table 3: O.E Regions Ranked by Number of Institutes Held

Rank		Number of Institutes	Proportion of Total
#1	Midwest	34	22%
2	West Coast	27	17
3½	Southeast	22	14
3½	Southwest	22	14
5	South Atlantic	15	10
6	Middle Atlantic	14	9
7½	North Plains	8	5
7½	Rocky Mountain	8	5
9	New England	4	3
	Guam, Puerto Rico	2	1 (not ranked)
		156	100%

Table 4: Distributions of Participants from Each O.E. Region and Participants Attending in Each O.E. Region

	Participants from Region		Participants who Attended Institutes in Region	
West Coast	763	17%	824	18%
Southeast	717	15	619	13
Midwest	658	14	1039	22
Southwest	577	12	662	14
South Atlantic	486	11	446	10
Middle Atlantic	403	9	341	7
North Plains	403	9	246	5
Rocky Mountain	373	7	297	6
New England	201	4	119	3
Puerto Rico, Guam	75	2	75	2
(foreign country)	(12)	100%	4668	100%
	4668			

Table 5: O.E. Regions Ranked by Amount of Institute Funds Awarded Per 10,000 Population

Rank		Amount Per 10,000
#1	Southeast	$5.61
2	West Coast	5.41
3	South Atlantic	5.06
4	Rocky Mountain	4.77
5	New England	4.06
6	Southwest	4.03
7	Midwest	3.95
8	North Plains	2.44
9	Middle Atlantic	.92

Table 6: O.E. Regions Ranked by Number of Participants from Region Per 100,000 Population

Rank		Number of Participants Per 100,000 Population
#1	Rocky Mountain	86
2½	West Coast	35
2½	Southeast	35
4	Southwest	32
5	South Atlantic	29
6	North Plains	26
7	New England	19
8	Midwest	18
9	Middle Atlantic	11

Table 7: O.E. Regions Ranked by Average Cost per Institute

Rank		Average Cost Per Institute	
#1	New England	$106,789	
2	Southeast	51,818	
3	North Plains	47,082	
4	South Atlantic	44,683	
5	West Coast	43,298	
6	Midwest	42,087	
7	Southwest	32,807	
8	Rocky Mountain	25,760	
9	Middle Atlantic	22,975	
	Puerto Rico, Guam	135,085	(not ranked)

Table 8: O.E. Regions Ranked by Average Cost per Participant

Rank		Average Cost Per Participant	
#1	New England	$3590	
2	Southeast	1842	
3	North Plains	1531	
4	South Atlantic	1503	
5	West Coast	1419	
6	Midwest	1377	
7	Southwest	1090	
8	Middle Atlantic	943	
9	Rocky Mountain	636	
	Puerto Rico, Guam	3602	(not ranked)

Table 9: Distribution of Institutes by State

	Number of Institutes	Proportion of Total
California	14	9.0%
Michigan	13	8.3
New York	9	5.8
Georgia	8	5.1
Louisiana	7	4.5
Oklahoma	7	4.5
Texas	7	4.5
North Carolina	6	3.8
Wisconsin	6	3.8
Illinois	5	3.2
Indiana	5	3.2
Kentucky	5	3.2
Mississippi	5	3.2
Ohio	5	3.2
Oregon	5	3.2
Colorado	4	2.6
Pennsylvania	4	2.6
Tennessee	4	2.6
Washington	4	2.6
Maryland	3	1.9
Massachusetts	3	1.9
Florida	2	1.3
Hawaii	2	1.3
Kansas	2	1.3
Minnesota	2	1.3
Missouri	2	1.3
Montana	2	1.3
South Carolina	2	1.3
Alabama	1	.6
Alaska	1	.6
Arizona	1	.6
Idaho	1	.6
Iowa	1	.6
New Jersey	1	.6
New Mexico	1	.6
South Dakota	1	.6
Utah	1	.6
Vermont	1	.6
District of Columbia	1	.6
Puerto Rico	1	.6
Guam	1	.6
	156	100 %

Table 10: Distribution of Participants at Institutes in Each State

	Number Attending	Proportion of Total
Michigan	453	9.7%
California	372	8.0
Louisiana	252	5.4
New York	213	4.6
Georgia	196	4.2
Texas	191	4.1
Oklahoma	190	4.1
North Carolina	176	3.8
Wisconsin	172	3.7
Oregon	171	3.7
Washington	163	3.5
Mississippi	160	3.4
Ohio	153	3.3
Colorado	151	3.2
Kentucky	147	3.1
Illinois	142	3.0
Indiana	120	2.6
Pennsylvania	104	2.2
Maryland	104	2.2
Tennessee	98	2.1
Massachusetts	90	1.9
Montana	90	1.9
Florida	69	1.5
Minnesota	69	1.5
Hawaii	60	1.3
South Carolina	60	1.3
Missouri	58	1.2
Kansas	57	1.2
Alabama	35	.7
South Dakota	35	.7
Arizona	30	.6
Idaho	30	.6
New Mexico	29	.6
Vermont	29	.6
Alaska	28	.6
Iowa	27	.6
Utah	26	.6
New Jersey	24	.5
District of Columbia	19	.4
Puerto Rico	25	.5
Guam	50	1.1
	4668	100 %

Table 11: Distribution of Institutes by Intensity of Program

Full-time	139	89%
Part-time	11	7
Combination	6	4
	156	100%

Table 12: Distribution of Institutes by Season of Year

Summer	104	67%
Other season	36	23
Combination	16	10
	156	100%

Table 13: Distribution of Institute by Duration

1 week, full-time	25	16%
2 weeks, full-time	41	26
3-8 weeks, full-time	60	38
1 semester, part-time	7	5
1 year, part-time	3	2
1 year, full-time	14	9
Combination	6	4
	156	100%

Table 14: Distribution of Institutes by Type of Library for Which Training is Intended

School libraries	61	39%
Public libraries	15	10
Special libraries	10	6
University/college libraries	9	6
Institutional libraries	8	5
Library school	7	4
Community college libraries	3	2
State Library	3	2
Other	1	1
Not specified	39	25
	156	100%

Table 15: Distribution of Institutes by Subject*

General librarianship	50	32%
Audio-visual materials	42	27
Group specialty	36	23
Administration	14	9
Technical services	13	8
Subject specialty	12	8
Selection	10	6
Automation	10	6
Systems analysis	4	3
Acquisition	3	2
Reference	3	2
Research	3	2
Personnel	2	1
Miscellaneous	10	6

*Several institutes were coded in more than one subject area; thus, the percentages are not totalled.

Table 16: Distribution of Institutes by Age of Patron Group Specified

Children	60	38%
Teenagers, youth	9	6
Adults	7	4
Aged	1	1
No age specified	79	51
	156	100%

Table 17: Distribution of Institutes by Ethnicity of Patron Group

Black	1	1%
Spanish-surnamed	3	2
American Indian	2	1
Combination	1	1
No ethnic group specified	149	95
	156	100%

Table 18: Distribution of Institutes by Other Characteristics of Patrons

Urban, poor, disadvantaged	13	8%
Institutionalized	6	4
Handicapped	2	1
Gifted	1	1
Not characterized	134	86
	156	100%

Table 19: Ways in Which Participants Heard About the Institute

Base=630 questionnaire respondents; multiple responses

Brochure mailed to my place of employment	186	30%
Brochure mailed to me	162	26
Publicity in professional literature (journals, etc.)	139	22
From my superiors	137	22
Other librarians or associates	98	16
Through my affiliation with the university at which the institute was held	69	11
Newspaper publicity	22	4
Some other way	28	4

Table 20: Number of Other HEA Title II-B Institutes Attended by Participants since 1968*

No others	582	92%
One other	41	7
Two others	7	1
	630	100%

* Note: Participants who attended more than one institute during the period under study - 1968-1969, were excluded from the questionnaire sample.

Table 21: Distribution of All Participants by Sex

Males	1318	28%
Females	3340	72
Not determined	10	*
	4668	100%

* Less than 0.5%; proportions unchanged when excluded.

Table 22: Distribution of All Participants by Race

White	3197	85%
Black	420	11
Oriental	68	2
Spanish-surnamed	54	1.4
American Indian	7	0.2
	3746	100 %

922 cases not reported - 20% of all participants

Table 23: Distribution of All Participants by Age at Time of Selection

30 and under	925	24%
31 to 40	1062	27
41 to 50	1124	29
51 to 60	690	18
61 and over	77	2
	3878	100%

790 cases not reported - 17% of all participants

Table 24: Distribution of Participants by Salary at Time of Selection

No salary	172	5%
Under $5000	226	7
$5000-7499	1048	33
$7500-9999	854	27
$10,000-14,999	754	24
$15,000 and over	123	4
	3177	100%

1491 cases not reported - 32% of all participants

Table 25: Sex Distribution of Participants by Type of Library for Which Training is Intended

School libraries:		
Males	184	13%
Females	1268	87
	1452	100%
Junior/community college libraries:		
Males	27	44%
Females	35	62
	62	100%
College/university libraries:		
Males	26	31%
Females	59	69
	85	100%
Public libraries:		
Males	65	22%
Females	231	78
	296	100%
Special libraries:		
Males	52	40%
Females	77	60
	129	100%
Library schools:		
Males	35	48%
Females	38	52
	73	100%
State agencies:		
Males	66	46%
Females	79	54
	145	100%

Table 26: Mean Salaries of Institute Participants by Sex, Race, and Age at Time of Selection
(Bases as shown, from a total of 4668)

Bases		Mean Salary
3006	Total population	$8576
853	Males	$10,825
2152	Females	7,684
2479	White	$8808
367	Black	7092
13	Oriental	10,023
41	Spanish-surnamed	4880*
7	American Indian	7571

* 25 of the Spanish-surnamed participants attended an institute in Puerto Rico for young sub-professionals.

711	30 and younger	$7019
806	31 to 40	8729
866	41 to 50	9241
513	51 to 60	9061
57	61 and older	10,244

Table 27: Distribution of Participants by State of Residence

	Number Residing	Proportion of Total
California	290	6.2%
Louisiana	238	5.1
New York	206	4.4
Texas	188	4.0
Mississippi	181	3.9
Illinois	177	3.8
Washington	174	3.7
North Carolina	172	3.7
Ohio	142	3.0
Oregon	137	2.9
Georgia	135	2.9
Indiana	133	2.8
Kentucky	132	2.8
Pennsylvania	125	2.7
Michigan	124	2.7
South Carolina	116	2.5
Colorado	113	2.4
Massachusetts	111	2.4
Minnesota	108	2.3
Florida	106	2.3
Montana	104	2.2
Alabama	96	2.1
Kansas	89	1.9
Tennessee	83	1.8
Wisconsin	82	1.8
Oklahoma	73	1.6
Maryland	72	1.5
Idaho	69	1.5
Iowa	67	1.4
New Jersey	64	1.4
Missouri	60	1.3
Utah	56	1.2
Virginia	56	1.2
Hawaii	54	1.2
Arizona	53	1.1
New Mexico	45	1.0
Alaska	35	.7
Vermont	35	.7
Arkansas	33	.7
Wyoming	31	.7
Nebraska	31	.7
South Dakota	28	.6
Connecticut	23	.5
West Virginia	22	.5

Table 27: (cont.)

	Number Residing	Proportion of Total
North Dakota	20	.4
Nevada	20	.4
Maine	15	.3
New Hampshire	10	.2
Delaware	8	.2
Rhode Island	7	.1
District of Columbia	24	.5
Puerto Rico	33	.7
Guam	51	1.1
Foreign country	12	.2

Table 28: Distribution of Participant Questionnaire Respondents by Sex

Males	117	28%
Females	452	72
Not determined	1	*
	630	100%

*Less than 0.5%; proportions unchanged when excluded.

Table 29: Distribution of Participant Questionnaire Respondents by Race

White	517	86%
Black	56	9
Oriental	17	3
Spanish-surnamed	3	0.5
American Indian	3	0.5
Other minorities	7	1
	603	100 %

27 cases not reported - 4% of all respondents

Table 30: Distribution of Participant Questionnaire Respondents by Age

30 and under	101	16%
31 to 40	167	27
41 to 50	188	30
51 to 60	148	24
61 and over	20	3
	624	100%

6 cases not reported - 1% of all respondents

Table 31: Distribution of Participant Questionnaire Respondents by Salary

Under $5000	24	4%
$5000-7499	62	11
$7500-9999	159	29
$10,000-12,499	156	28
$12,500-14,999	74	13
$15,000 and over	85	15
	560	100%

70 cases not reported - 11% of all respondents

Table 28: Distribution of Participant Questionnaire Respondents by Sex

Males	117	28%
Females	452	72
Not determined	1	*
	630	100%

*Less than 0.5%; proportions unchanged when excluded.

Table 29: Distribution of Participant Questionnaire Respondents by Race

White	517	86%
Black	56	9
Oriental	17	3
Spanish-surnamed	3	0.5
American Indian	3	0.5
Other minorities	7	1
	603	100 %

27 cases not reported - 4% of all respondents

Table 30: Distribution of Participant Questionnaire Respondents by Age

30 and under	101	16%
31 to 40	167	27
41 to 50	188	30
51 to 60	148	24
61 and over	20	3
	624	100%

6 cases not reported - 1% of all respondents

Table 31: Distribution of Participant Questionnaire Respondents by Salary

Under $5000	24	4%
$5000-7499	62	11
$7500-9999	159	29
$10,000-12,499	156	28
$12,500-14,999	74	13
$15,000 and over	85	15
	560	100%

70 cases not reported - 11% of all respondents

Table 32: Highest Level of Education Attained by Participant Respondents

Less than bachelor's	23	4%
Bachelor's	174	27
Master's	414	66
Doctorate	16	3
	627	100%

3 cases not reported - 0.5% of respondents

Table 33: Whether Library Science Degree Held by Participant Respondents

Yes	404	64%
No	226	36
	630	100%

Table 34: Highest Library Science Degree Held by Participant Respondents

Associate	3	1%
Bachelor's	66	16
Master's	330	82
Doctorate	5	1
	404	100%

Table 35: Extent of Library Science Education Among Respondents Without Library Science Degrees

"Have completed courses in library science for academic credit"	160	70%
"Have not...."	63	28
No response	3	2
	226	100%

Table 36: Highest Non-library Degree Held by Participant Respondents

High school diploma	63	10%
Associate degree	9	1
Bachelor's degree	369	59
Master's degree	164	26
Doctorate	11	2
Other	11	2
	627	100%

3 cases not reported - 0.5% of all respondents

Table 37: Certification of Participant Respondents

State certification as a teacher	329	52%
State certification as a school librarian	199	32
State certification as a librarian	194	31
Other certification (media specialist, etc.)	46	7

NOTE: Figures not totalled as respondents may be certified in more than one area.

Table 38: Employment Status of Participant Respondents

Employed full-time	578	93%
Employed part-time	20	3
Other arrangement	9	2
Not employed	12	2
	619	100%

11 cases not reported - 2% of all respondents

Table 39: Whether Participant Respondents Employed as Librarians

Employed as librarian	528	84%
Not employed as librarian	101	16
	629	100%

1 case not reported - 0.2% of all respondents

Table 40: Place of Employment of Participant Respondents

School library	240	40%
University library	116	19
Public library	104	17
State Library	32	5
Community college library	21	4
Special library	19	3
Institutional library	13	2
	(Subtotal: employed in libraries	90%)
Library school	16	3
All other	43	7
	604	100%

26 cases not reported - 4% of all respondents

Table 41: Administrative Level at Which Respondents Are Employed

General administration (as in a small library)	231	38%
Head (as of large library)	118	19
Assistant head	35	6
Department head	84	14
Other supervisory position	34	6
Non-supervisory position	102	17
	604	100%

26 cases not reported - 4% of all respondents

Table 42: Specific Duties Reported by Respondents

General librarianship (including administration)	402	64%
Teaching	41	7
Group specialty	29	5
Reference	23	4
Subject specialty	23	4
Consulting	21	3
Audio-visual specialty	19	3

NOTE: Not reported by all respondents; more than one mentioned by some respondents.

Table 43: Career Changes and Their Relationship to Institute Attendance as Reported by Participant Respondents

	YES, Change Occurred	"If YES, to what degree was the change related to participation?" Strongly Related	Somewhat Related	Not Related	No Response
		(Percentaged across)			
I have accepted employment with a different organization since I attended the institute.	21% (127)	26%	31%	41%	2%
My salary has increased, above a normal cost-of-living increase, since I attended the institute.	43% (263)	15	37	37	11
More people report directly to me since I attended the institute.	37% (228)	21	44	26	9
I exercise greater responsibility in my position since I attended the institute.	57% (346)	26	48	16	10
I have initiated changes in the organization which employs me since I attended the institute.	69% (420)	32	48	8	12
I have advanced to a higher position since I attended the institute.	27% (162)	30	37	24	9

Table 44: Ways in Which Participant Respondents Reported the Institute Was Most Valuable to Them

As a source of new skills or knowledge in my field.	285	45%
As a means of meeting other professionals in my field.	160	25
As a means of renewing my interest in my work.	55	9
As a means to a better position/higher salary.	15	2
In some other way.	29	5
More than one response; no response	86	14
	630	100%

Table 45: Distribution of Director Questionnaire Respondents by Age

31 to 40	12	15%
41 to 50	26	33
51 to 60	27	35
61 and over	13	17
	78	100%

Table 46: Distribution of Director Respondents by Academic Rank

Professor	28	37%
Associate professor	24	31
Assistant professor	10	13
Instructor	2	3
Lecturer	1	1
Non-academic	12	15
	77	100%

1 case not reported - 1% of director sample

Table 47: Highest Degree Held by Director Respondents

Doctorate	40	51%
Master's Library Science	21	27
Master's, other	14	18
Bachelor's	3	4
	78	100%

Table 48: Distribution of Director Respondents by Salary

Under $12,500	11	15%
$12,500-14,999	18	24
$15,000-19,999	21	28
$20,000 and over	25	33
	75	100%

3 cases not reported - 4% of director sample

Table 49: Directors' Responses to Statements Postulating Career Changes as Consequences of Their Roles as Directors

Serving as an institute director has resulted in my deriving greater satisfaction from my work:

Yes	53	68%
No	17	22
No response	8	10
	78	100%

Serving as an institute director has resulted in changes in my attitudes which are favorably reflected in my work:

Yes	41	53%
No	16	21
No response	21	26
	78	100%

Serving as an institute director has favorably affected the amount of respect accorded me by my colleagues:

Yes	38	49%
No	15	19
No response	25	32
	78	100%

Serving as an institute director has favorably affected my opportunity for promotion:

Yes	19	24%
No	47	60
No response	12	16
	78	100%

Serving as an institute director has favorably affected my basic salary:

Yes	15	19%
No	45	58
No response	18	23
	78	100%

Table 50a: Rankings of Possible Reasons for Serving as a Director
(Number of Directors Assigning Rank to Each Reason)

	Ranked: 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No Response
Opportunity to follow a professional interest:	16	13	9	7	11	2	0	2	1	0	17
Gain additional support/prestige for the institution:	16	7	12	10	4	7	2	5	0	0	15
Possession of skills and knowledge about the subject of the institute:	11	13	10	5	5	4	5	1	2	1	21
Desire to work with anticipated participants:	4	13	11	14	9	5	4	4	1	0	13
Requested to do so by academic superior:	3	5	2	3	4	2	4	2	7	9	37
Interest in learning more about the subject matter:	2	4	12	4	8	9	6	5	0	0	28
Prior experiences in continuing education:	2	2	7	9	4	9	4	6	3	2	30
Desire to gain experience in continuing education:	1	7	4	5	8	5	9	4	3	2	30
Supplement or increase income:	1	0	0	4	1	2	4	1	8	18	39
Opportunity for professional advancement:	1	1	1	5	5	5	4	8	10	1	37

Table 50b: Rankings of Possible Reasons for Serving as a Director
(Percentage of Directors Assigning Rank to Each Reason)

	Ranked: 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No Response
Opportunity to follow a professional interest:	20%	17	11	9	14	3	0	3	1	0	22%
Gain additional support/prestige for the institution:	21%	9	15	13	5	9	3	6	0	0	19%
Possession of skills and knowledge about the subject of the institute:	14%	17	13	6	7	5	6	1	3	1	27%
Desire to work with anticipated participants:	5%	17	14	18	12	6	5	5	1	0	17%
Requested to do so by academic superior:	4%	6	3	4	5	3	5	3	9	11	47%
Interest in learning more about the subject matter:	3%	5	15	5	10	12	8	6	0	0	36%
Prior experiences in continuing education:	3%	3	9	11	5	11	5	8	4	3	38%
Desire to gain experience in continuing education:	1%	9	5	6	10	6	12	5	4	3	39%
Supplement or increase income:	1%	0	0	5	1	3	5	1	10	24	50%
Opportunity for professional advancement:	1%	1	1	7	7	6	5	10	13	1	48%